DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 382 094 HE 028 295

TITLE	Accountability Review: Progress Report 1. Report and Conclusions.
INSTITUTION	Florida State Postsecondary Education Planning Commission, Tallahassee.
PUB DATE	94
NOTE	55p.; For a related document, see HE 028 296.
AVAILABLE FROM	Postsecondary Education Planning Commission, 231 Collins Building, Department of Education, Tallahassee, FL 32399-0400.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Accountability; *Evaluation Criteria; Government School Relationship; Higher Education; In State Students; Private Colleges; Public Colleges; State Legislation; State Universities; Statewide Planning; Student Financial Aid
IDENTIFIERS	*Florida; Florida Resident Access Grant

ABSTRACT

In response to Florida legislative mandate, this document reports on accountability measures and an accountability process for independent institutions of higher education that participate in the Florida resident access grant program and on the design and implementation of the accountability processes of the state postsecondary institutions. After an introductory chapter, chapter 2 suggests a two-tier approach for conducting accountability reviews: an annual review of accountability information form public system reports and from public and private institution reports, and a cumulative review every 5 years. Annual reviews of public institutions would include a representative sample of 10 institutions (7 community colleges and 3 universities). Chapter 3 describes an accountability process and measures for independent institutions and provides a benefits and cost effectiveness analysis of the Florida Resident Access Grant program. Chapter 4 summarizes findings and conclusions and proposes: (1) annual Commission review of accountability processes and reports for public and private systems; (2) annual review of public institutional reports and plans; (3) performance indicators for independent institutions; (4) annual accountability reports from the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida (ICUF); and (5) new reporting dates for improved quality of data. Also included are recommendations for summative evaluation and incentive funding. Extensive appendixes contain statutory language, evaluation questions, lists of ICUF member institutions and resource group members, tables, and results of a survey of Access Grant recipients, Fall 1994. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 382 094

ACCOUNTABILITY REVIEW: PROGRESS REPORT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Florida Postsecondary Education Planning Commission

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

Report and Conclusions of the Florida Postsecondary Education Planning Commission

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1994 - Report 1

HE 028 295

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION PLANNING COMMISSION

H. Clyde Hobby, Chairman
New Port Richey

Richard C. Alterman
Opa Locka

Inez W. Bailey
Niceville

Ivie R. Burch
Panama City

Vilma T. Diaz
Margate

Sally M. Gillespie
New Smyrna Beach

Thomas J. Haynes
Tallahassee

Ramiro J. Inguanzo
Miami

Robert B. Mautz
Gainesville

Karen L. Plunkett
Orlando

Mark K. Wheeler
Fort Lauderdale

William B. Proctor, Executive Director

The Postsecondary Education Planning Commission, initially created by executive order in 1980 and subsequently given statutory authority (SS 240.145 and 240.147, Florida Statutes), serves as a citizen board to coordinate the efforts of postsecondary institutions and provide independent policy analyses and recommendations to the State Board of Education and the Legislature. The Commission is composed of 11 members of the general public and one full-time student registered at a postsecondary education institution in Florida. Members are appointed by the Governor with the approval of three members of the State Board of Education and subject to confirmation by the Senate.

The major responsibility of the Commission is preparing and updating every five years a master plan for postsecondary education. The enabling legislation provides that the Plan "shall include consideration of the promotion of quality, fundamental educational goals, programmatic access, needs for remedial education, regional and state economic development, international education programs, demographic patterns, student demand for programs, needs of particular subgroups of the population, implementation of innovative educational techniques and technology, and the requirements of the labor market. The capacity of existing programs, in both public and independent institutions, to respond to identified needs shall be evaluated and a plan shall be developed to respond efficiently to unmet needs."

Other responsibilities include recommending to the State Board of Education program contracts with independent institutions; advising the State Board regarding the need for and location of new programs, branch campuses and centers of public postsecondary education institutions; periodically reviewing the accountability processes and reports of the public and independent postsecondary sectors; reviewing public postsecondary education budget requests for compliance with the State Master Plan; and periodically conducting special studies, analyses, and evaluations related to specific postsecondary education issues and programs.

Further information about the Commission, its publications, meetings and other activities may be obtained from the Commission office, 231 Collins Building, Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida, 32399-0400; telephone (904) 488-7894; FAX (904) 922-5388.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION PLANNING COMMISSION

ACCOUNTABILITY REVIEW:

PROGRESS REPORT

Prepared in Response to Specific Appropriation 573
of the
1994 General Appropriations Act
Chapter 94-357, Laws of Florida
and
Chapter 94-230, Laws of Florida

December, 1994

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....i

I. INTRODUCTION.....1

II. STATE-LEVEL EVALUATION OF ACCOUNTABILITY IN POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION.....4

Annual Evaluation
Summative (Fifth-Year) Evaluation

III. ACCOUNTABILITY FOR THE INDEPENDENT SECTOR.....8

Accountability Measures for ICUF Institutions
The Florida Resident Access Grant: Background
Assessment of the FRAG

IV. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS.....14

Annual Review of Accountability
Summative Evaluation
Incentive Funding

REFERENCES

APPENDICES

A Statutory References for Accountability
B Questions for State-Level Accountability Evaluations
C Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida: Member Institutions
D Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida Accountability Resource Group
E Tables Related to Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida
F Survey of Florida Resident Access Grant Recipients, Fall 1994

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Proviso language accompanying Specific Appropriation 573 of the 1994 General Appropriations Act directed the Commission to review and evaluate public postsecondary education accountability plans as they relate to the mission and goals of each system and its respective institutions as well as the goals articulated by the Legislature. A report was to be submitted by January 1, 1995. This language continues the accountability work initiated by the Commission in its study, ***Accountability in Florida's Postsecondary Education System***, submitted to the State Board of Education and the Legislature in January 1994. Additionally, the 1994 Legislature revised the Commission's statutory authority (Section 240.147, Florida Statutes) with inclusion of two directives relative to accountability:

In consultation with the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida, recommend to the Legislature accountability measures and an accountability process for independent institutions that participate in the Florida resident access grant program. The process shall make use of existing information submitted to the federal and state governments. The process shall provide for an assessment of the benefits and cost-effectiveness of the Florida resident access grant program in providing state residents with access to 4-year college programs and with the successful completion of a baccalaureate degree. The commission shall provide oversight of this accountability process.

Periodically review the design and implementation of the accountability processes and reports of the State University System, State Community College System, and public and independent postsecondary institutions. At least every 5 years, evaluate the extent to which each plan is contributing to the achievement of state goals for postsecondary education and report to the State Board of Education, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with recommendations on any changes needed in the accountability process or plans.

This progress report addresses the Commission's activities in both of these areas. First, the Commission suggests a process to review system and institutional reports in relation to state goals for postsecondary education. The second chapter describes an accountability process and measures for independent institutions and provides a benefits and cost-effectiveness analysis of the Florida Resident Access Grant program. The closing chapter summarizes the Commission's findings and conclusions.

The Commission suggests a two-tier approach for conducting the accountability reviews: (1) an annual review of accountability information from public system reports and public and private institution reports, and (2) a cumulative review every five years. Annual reviews of public institutions will include a representative sample of ten institutions (seven community colleges and three universities). Over a period of four years, all public universities and community colleges will be reviewed. The major focus of the annual reviews will be on institutional improvement and examining the relationship between implementing accountability and improvement in institutional effectiveness. Accountability which focuses on institutional improvement places the major responsibility for assessment and reporting at the campus level. Additionally, state-level monitoring of postsecondary accountability provides an opportunity to promote stronger linkages between accountability in higher education and key state-level processes such as strategic planning and performance-based budgeting.

A second area of concentration will be an analysis of progress toward achieving state priorities. Analyses will examine the contributions of public institutions as well as the state's 23 accredited independent institutions to the achievement of the priorities. Fiscal realities impose restraints on accountability and expectations for meeting state needs. In addressing this problem, the **Master Plan for Florida Postsecondary Education**--***Challenges, Realities, Strategies***--endorsed the targeting of a few priorities. Based on a review of all current postsecondary master plans in Florida as well as strategic plans prepared by the Department of Education and the Office of the Governor, ***Accountability in Florida's Postsecondary Education System*** identified three common concerns as state priority areas for a focused accountability review: ***access/diversity, quality of undergraduate education, and productivity***. These priority areas also support the State Comprehensive Plan's goal statement for education.

In addition to describing an accountability process for annual and summative evaluations, the progress report addresses the Commission's responsibility to consult with the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida (ICUF) to recommend an accountability process and measures for independent institutions that participate in the Florida Resident Access Grant program. Through collaboration with ICUF, the Commission identified measures and developed strategies to assess the benefits and cost-effectiveness of the Florida Resident Access Grant. The Commission's assessment focuses primarily on the program's benefits and cost-effectiveness to the State. This report contains initial analyses and outlines a plan for conducting such analyses on an ongoing basis.

Based on findings arising from the study, the Commission submits the following conclusions:

Annual Review of Accountability

(1) The Commission will prepare a report annually which reviews the design and implementation of the accountability processes and reports of the public systems as well as of public and private institutions. The purpose of the Commission's annual report will be twofold: (a) examine the relationship between accountability and achieving continual improvement in institutional effectiveness, and (b) assess progress toward achieving state priorities.

(2) Submission of an annual review of a representative sample of public institutional reports and plans--rather than a review of all institutional reports--will allow the Commission to meet statutory reporting requirements in a short time frame. All institutions in the public systems will be reviewed within a four-year period. Thus, the Commission will annually review accountability plans and reports from three universities and seven community colleges. Each year's group of approximately ten institutions will be selected jointly with staff from the State University System and the Community College system to represent diversity within each system. To the extent possible, the selection will be based on institutional mission, geographic location, and size.

(3) The performance indicators for independent institutions proposed in this report are appropriate initial accountability measures to assess the contribution of accredited independent institutions in the achievement of the statewide priorities for quality undergraduate education, access/diversity, and productivity. A review of ICUF reports over the first few years may

indicate that current measures need to be amended.

(4) Since the Commission will be requesting system reports from the public sector, a parallel procedure will be for Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida to compile an accountability report with aggregate and individual institutional data on each measure for its member institutions. ICUF members will reach agreement on a standardized method of reporting data related to each measure. The Commission's role will be one of review and analysis of sector-wide information. The Commission's annual review will summarize the contribution of ICUF institutions to the achievement of statewide priorities and will display institution-specific data through appendices. Additionally, the annual review will include cost effectiveness analyses such as (1) comparisons of cost to the State to educate in the public sector those Florida Resident Access Grant recipients with financial need and (2) comparisons of cost to produce graduates in the public and independent sectors.

(5) Changing annual reporting dates for system-level accountability reports from December 31st to March 1st will enhance the quality of the data and the analyses submitted to the Legislature. It is understood that extending the annual system reporting dates from December to March will enable the systems to use prior year's data for their annual accountability report. Additionally, submission of the annual ICUF accountability report by March 1st will facilitate the Commission's analysis of comparable year information and completion of its annual accountability report.

(6) A reporting date of November 1st for the Commission's annual evaluation of institutional accountability reports will allow opportunity to review individual institutional reports and the system reports after they are finalized rather than during the process of development. The Commission will submit the first annual accountability evaluation by November 1, 1995 and annually thereafter.

Summative Evaluation

(7) To meet statutory requirements to "at least every 5 years, evaluate the extent to which each plan is contributing to the achievement of state goals for postsecondary education," the Commission will submit a fifth-year or summative report recapitulating and synthesizing the results of the prior four years reviews into a single report which evaluates progress toward state goals. The Commission will submit the first summative analysis of progress toward State goals by November 1, 1999.

(8) The summative evaluation of accountability will also include an analysis of the benefits and cost-effectiveness of FRAG, utilizing data such as enrollment trends, student perceptions survey results, and comparisons of state costs to enroll and graduate students in the public and independent sectors.

(9) In conjunction with the periodic analysis of progress toward state goals, the Commission will strive for a comprehensive evaluation, including analysis of support from those state-level bodies with the funding and policy-making authority to influence accountability.

Incentive Funding

(10) Provision for each public community college and university to compete for accountability incentive grants will support State and institutional commitment to the priority areas. Incentive initiatives will be tied to performance and attainment of specified objectives for the priority areas of

access/diversity, productivity, and quality. Specific objectives might include increases in minority graduation rates, graduates in high cost programs serving targeted economic development occupational clusters, and other objectives tied to attainment of accountability goals.

I. INTRODUCTION

Proviso language accompanying Specific Appropriation 573 of the 1994 General Appropriations Act directed the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission to:

review and evaluate the accountability plans in public postsecondary education as they relate to the mission and goals of each system and its respective institutions as well as the goals as articulated by the Legislature. The review and evaluation shall specifically address the extent to which the institutional and systemwide plans should be modified to provide for specific, measurable goals. The report, including any suggested modifications to the plans, shall be submitted to the Legislature and the State Board of Education by January 1, 1995.

This language continues the accountability work initiated by the Commission in its study, ***Accountability in Florida's Postsecondary Education System***, submitted to the State Board of Education and the Legislature in January 1994. Additionally, the 1994 Legislature revised the Commission's statutory authority (Section 240.147, Florida Statutes) with inclusion of two directives relative to accountability:

In consultation with the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida, recommend to the Legislature accountability measures and an accountability process for independent institutions that participate in the Florida resident access grant program. The process shall make use of existing information submitted to the federal and state governments. The process shall provide for an assessment of the benefits and cost-effectiveness of the Florida resident access grant program in providing state residents with access to 4-year college programs and with the successful completion of a baccalaureate degree. The commission shall provide oversight of this accountability process.

Periodically review the design and implementation of the accountability processes and reports of the State University System, State Community College System, and public and independent postsecondary institutions. At least every 5 years, evaluate the extent to which each plan is contributing to the achievement of state goals for postsecondary education and report to the State Board of Education, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with recommendations on any changes needed in the accountability process or plans.

This document reports on the Commission's progress in both of these areas. First, the Commission suggests a process to review system and institutional reports in relation to state goals for postsecondary education. The following section suggests an accountability process and measures for independent institutions and reports on a benefits and cost-effectiveness analysis of the Florida Resident Access Grant program.

The Commission anticipates that accountability reports will address ongoing concerns with issues such as comparability, consistency, accuracy, and timeliness of data, relationship of accountability to master plan goals, state priority areas, agency strategic plans, budgeting procedures, and institutional improvement. State-level monitoring of postsecondary accountability provides occasion to promote stronger linkages between accountability in higher education and key state-level processes such as strategic planning and performance-based budgeting. The Commission continues to believe that accountability provides an opportunity for change as well as a challenge--through the system and institutional plans and reports, public postsecondary education has an opportunity to reassert its ability to define and manage its direction.

The Commission's Finance/Administration Committee had oversight for this progress report. The Committee was chaired by Ivie Burch; other members were Vilma Diaz, Robert Mautz, Karen Plunkett, Michael Roberts, and Mark Wheeler. The Committee met six times between June and December 1994 to review information concerning the study and to receive public testimony. Other agencies and offices consulted during the study were the State University System, the Community College System, Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida, the Office of Program Policy Analysis and Governmental Accountability, staff from the Legislature and the Governor's Office, as well as individuals in various public and independent colleges and universities. The Commission particularly acknowledges and appreciates the participation and cooperation of staff from the Board of Regents, the State Board of Community Colleges, and the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida institutions.

Background

Florida's accountability legislation, as that of other states, is directed toward issues important to legislators and their constituencies. Most existing accountability legislation was crafted in response to a perceived concern that the public did not have adequate and appropriate information about how colleges and universities function. There is much similarity across the states' accountability activities, partially because states have based accountability requirements on the kinds of data accessible through existing collection mechanisms.

The status of accountability nationally may be illustrated through a continuum of activities, characterized by "extensive oversight" on one end and "no oversight" on the other. In between are variations including "much oversight," "minimal oversight" and "optional oversight." "Extensive oversight" would be characterized by legislatively mandated measures with reporting requirements and state-level evaluation and comment; Florida is at this end of the continuum along with Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Tennessee, and Wisconsin. At the next stage, "much oversight," are states also having mandated measures with reporting requirements, but no state-level evaluation/comment. South Carolina and Maryland illustrate this stage. "Minimal oversight" means there are no mandated measures but a report is required where institutions assess their performance; Virginia and West Virginia are at this stage. Few states are at the "optional" level where individual institutions may voluntarily submit accountability or institutional effectiveness information. Nebraska's approach of encouraging institutions to link accountability with the National Education Goals initiative exemplifies this stage.

Accountability in Florida has evolved since legislative action in 1991 produced statutory accountability reporting requirements for the State University System and the Community College System; the university accountability statute was revised during the 1993 legislative session (Appendix A). Initial accountability reports were submitted by each system in December 1992 and 1993; each system has had a committee structure in place since 1991 to enhance institutional participation and to facilitate the development of the plans at both the system and institutional level. Also during this period, the Office of the Auditor General assessed the accountability plans of the systems, and the House Higher Education Committee produced an interim report related to improving oversight and increasing management flexibility of postsecondary education. Most recently, the Office of Program Policy Analysis and Government Accountability (OPPAGA) issued ***Assessment***

of Revised State University System Accountability Plan, a report evaluating the 1993 revised university system plan.

At the direction of the 1993 Legislature, the Commission also addressed accountability. In its report, ***Accountability in Florida's Postsecondary Education System,*** the Commission outlined a comprehensive accountability process founded on a dual-purpose approach: the primary purpose of accountability should be to foster improvement at the institutional level; a second, yet significant, purpose is to provide information to state-level policy makers. The study noted that while systems and institutions responded to statutory requirements and expanded the measures in some areas, initial reports did not provide meaningful improvement in institutional effectiveness or respond adequately to policy leaders' concerns with critical statewide educational priorities. The Commission concluded that existing legislation and institutional responses did not sufficiently embody the kinds of characteristics that would lead to improved management at the local level and provide for systematic, ongoing assessment. In accord with the Commission's recommendation in that report, legislation now links the achievement of state goals with accountability for postsecondary education.

II. STATE-LEVEL EVALUATION OF ACCOUNTABILITY IN POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

In fulfilling the legislative charge to evaluate accountability reports and the extent to which each is contributing to the achievement of state goals, questions posed in the Commission's 1993 report, ***Accountability in Florida's Postsecondary Education System***, will be used to frame and interpret the public's concern with accountability:

(1) How can institutions improve on what they are doing?

(2) How will the Legislature and the general public know the institutions are using available resources effectively and efficiently?

The following subsections respond to these questions. The first subsection outlines the proposed approach for the Commission's annual evaluation of institutional and system plans and progress toward state priorities as well as the proposed methodology for conducting this evaluation. The second subsection describes the summative or fifth-year evaluation activity.

Annual Evaluation

To fulfill the Commission's statutory responsibility to "periodically review the design and implementation of the accountability processes and reports," the Commission proposes to annually review a cross section of public institutional accountability reports and plans. One focus of the annual reviews will be on institutional improvement and examining the relationship between implementing accountability and achieving continuous improvement in institutional effectiveness. A second area of concentration will be an analysis of progress toward achieving state priorities.

The Commission's annual reviews of individual public sector institutional reports will address several questions related to major concerns in assessing accountability for institutional effectiveness (Appendix B) and for state priorities. As expressed by the Commission in 1993, accountability which focuses on institutional improvement places the major responsibility for assessment and reporting at the campus level.

For an accountability policy with this overriding purpose to function, there must be minimal interference or guidance from state-level entities. Yet, the onus of establishing that postsecondary education institutions are achieving the State's mission "to develop human resources, to discover and disseminate knowledge, to extend knowledge and its application beyond the boundaries of its campuses, and to serve and stimulate society by developing in students heightened intellectual, cultural, and humane sensitivities; scientific, professional, and technological expertise; and a sense of purpose" (Section 240.105(2), Florida Statutes) falls directly on the campuses. Individually and collectively, the colleges and universities are responsible for fulfilling this mission; accountability requires the institutions to assess their ability and performance in accomplishing the mission and, concurrently, identify areas to address in order to improve performance.

Thus, the Commission's annual review will consider institutional-specific goals supported by distinctive objectives in the institutional plans. Specific measures are needed for the goals and objectives in order to evaluate the level of goal achievement. The Commission has endorsed an allowance for some variation in measures in order to preserve unique

institutional missions among institutions and to enable individual colleges and universities to evaluate institutional goals beyond those required in statute for systemwide reporting. Institutional improvement should be comprehensive and address all facets of the institution, with emphasis on the teaching/learning process and student performance. The Commission believes that, while colleges and universities should have flexibility in designing their individual responses to accountability, accountability for institutional improvement should be comprehensive, with foundations in a plan comprised of common characteristics. The Commission's 1993 report suggested that accountability for continuous institutional improvement should:

1. Be linked to the State's mission for postsecondary education and the institutional mission.

2. Be related to specific institutional goals.

3. Incorporate multiple assessment measures collected over time.

4. Be systematic by providing routinely collected and analyzed information.

5. Allow for comparison of an institution's current and past performance, for comparisons among Florida institutions and with peer institutions, as well as for comparison against predetermined goals.

6. Evaluate the process as well as the inputs and the products.

7. Include assessment of the achievement of general education objectives by undergraduate students.

8. Encourage faculty, student, staff, and community participation in both planning and implementation.

9. Demonstrate that assessment results have been incorporated in institutional decision making at the departmental or unit level.

10. Demonstrate that budget requests are linked to improvement plans--that the institution targeted areas for improvement and reallocated its resources to impact those target areas.

11. Be available to the public in an understandable format.

The characteristics listed above support legislative interest as stated in accountability statutes for the State University System and the Community College System:

It is the intent of the Legislature that a management and accountability process be implemented which provides for the systematic, ongoing improvement and assessment of the improvement of the quality and efficiency of the State Community College System. Accordingly, the State Board of Community Colleges and the community college boards of trustees shall develop and implement a plan to improve and evaluate the instructional and administrative efficiency and effectiveness of the State Community College System. (Section 240.324, (1), F.S.)

It is the intent of the Legislature that an accountability process be implemented which provides for the systematic, ongoing evaluation of quality and effectiveness in the State University System. It is further the intent of the Legislature that this accountability process monitor performance at the system level in each of the major areas of instruction, research, and public services, while recognizing the differing missions of each of the state universities...The accountability process shall result in an annual accountability report to the Legislature (Section 240.214, F.S.)

These statutory provisions should be considered within a state-level evaluation of accountability efforts and requirements. In this vein, the Commission's 1993 report further suggested that accountability at the state level should:

1. Foster institutional improvement.

2. Be based on the mission statement of the State's postsecondary system.

3. Be related to a few specific state priorities.

4. Be related to Commission and system Master Plan goals.

5. Contain a few key measures for each priority.

6. Include performance at a single point in time and trends.

7. Provide a comparison with peer systems or states.

8. Include major institutional functions.

9. Evaluate inputs, process, output, and outcomes.

10. Be available to the public in an accessible and understandable format.

There are several points of commonality between the two lists. This is appropriate since accountability for institutional improvement and accountability at the state level should complement each other. The second list, characteristics of state-level accountability, also introduces the need to relate accountability to a few specific state priorities. The Commission's annual report will review the selected institutional reports, the system reports, and the independent sector report in order to determine progress in three priority areas. Based on a review of system and Commission master plans as well as strategic plans prepared by the Department of Education and the Office of the Governor, three common areas were identified as state priority areas for a focused accountability review: ***access/diversity, quality of undergraduate education, and productivity***. These priority areas also support the State Comprehensive Plan, its primary goal for education, and the several policies enumerated for the goal (Chapter 187, Laws of Florida).

Over a period of four years, all ten public universities and 28 public community colleges will be reviewed. Each year's group of approximately nine institutions (two SUS and seven CCS institutions) will represent diversity within each system. To the extent possible, the selection will be based on institutional mission, geographic location, and size. Additionally, aggregate information for the state's 23 accredited independent institutions will be reviewed. In prior outcomes and accountability studies, the Commission acknowledged the wide range of assessment and reporting activities taking place at the institutional and system levels in Florida. We support the important role that existing, ongoing campus activities such as program review, regional and specialized accreditation, state as well as federal reporting requirements, and strategic and master planning have in responding to accountability law. It is not the Commission's intent to burden institutions or systems with additional reporting. Consistent with our past position and given the amount and variety of present reports, the Commission will not request that institutions prepare special information requests for the state-level accountability review but will solicit the same institutional and system annual accountability plans and data reports submitted to fulfill statutory accountability requirements.

Summative (Fifth-Year) Evaluation

To fulfill the statutory responsibility to "at least every 5 years, evaluate the extent to which each plan is contributing to the achievement of state goals for postsecondary education," the fifth year's report will summarize the results of the prior four years' reviews into a single document. This summative report will address two major concerns: (1) What progress has been made toward achieving state priorities for access/diversity, quality of undergraduate education, and productivity? (2) Have state-level entities with funding and policy-making authority to influence accountability provided adequate and appropriate policy guidance and fiscal support for accountability expectations? Fiscal realities impose restraints on accountability and expectations for meeting state needs. In addressing this problem last year, the Commission's master plan, ***Challenges, Realities, Strategies,*** as well as its accountability study endorsed the targeting of a few priorities, since neither the State nor its institutions have the resources to concentrate on everything all of the time. Three areas identified as state priority areas are access, undergraduate education and productivity.

Concentration on a few statewide priorities also facilitates cross-referencing critical issues with budget issues and accountability of other state-level agencies. Relative to the second concern for summative evaluation, the Commission reiterates the position taken in its 1993 study on accountability in Florida: the State must be prepared to hold all levels accountable and to evaluate the impact of the accountability process as public policy. As a starting point, the following questions posed by the Southern Regional Education Board (1993) should be considered as part of the summative evaluation of the accountability process:

* Have state policies produced constructive and substantive educational changes at the campus level, or have campus responses been largely cosmetic and adaptive?

* Has the implementation of state accountability policies led to increased awareness of, confidence in, and support of higher education?

* Are political and educational leaders using the extensive accountability reporting?

* Do states have policies that support improvement in both favorable and unfavorable economic times, and do these policies survive changes in leadership at the executive level?

Accountability of state policy is an important component of a comprehensive assessment of the effectiveness of the State's postsecondary education system. The fifth-year or summative evaluation will assess progress made in three state priority areas, and it will assess the effectiveness of accountability as public policy.

III. ACCOUNTABILITY FOR THE INDEPENDENT SECTOR

In 1994, the Florida Legislature directed the Commission to consult with the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida (ICUF) to recommend an accountability process and measures for independent institutions that participate in the Florida Resident Access Grant program (Section 240.147, Florida Statutes). Membership in ICUF requires that an institution be four-year, nonprofit, and accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). The 23 ICUF institutions are eligible to participate in the Florida Resident Access Grant (FRAG) program, and all did in 1993-94 (Appendix C).

As part of the consultation process, the Commission convened a resource group of institutional representatives to discuss issues relating to state-level accountability for ICUF institutions (Appendix D). Additionally, ICUF members of the resource group provided testimony during public hearings on this study, and Commission staff met with the ICUF Presidents' Council.

The Legislature asserts its support for independent higher education in Section 246.011(1), F.S.: "The Legislature encourages privately supported higher education and intends to aid in protecting the integrity of degrees conferred by privately supported colleges." The education goal in the State Comprehensive Plan also contains a policy statement concerning the independent sector: "Recognize private universities and colleges as an important component of Florida's higher educational system." In its 1982 ***Master Plan for Florida Postsecondary Education*** and subsequent documents, the Commission has supported a strong dual system of higher education to promote student choice and institutional diversity.

According to the State Board of Independent Colleges and Universities, Florida residents made up 65 percent of all students enrolled in ICUF institutions in the Fall 1993 semester. FRAG eligible students--those Florida residents who are full-time undergraduates--accounted for 53 percent of the full-time undergraduate enrollment in ICUF institutions (Appendix E).

In its 1993 report, ***How Floridians Pay for College***, the Commission found that the 1991 median family income for resident dependent students who attended Florida's private baccalaureate institutions was $45,850. The figure was $50,750 for students who attended public four-year institutions and $36,780 for dependents attending Florida's community colleges.

The capacity of ICUF institutions to accommodate more full-time state residents has been the subject of much speculation. A survey of institutional presidents indicates that, within existing facilities, ICUF has the capacity for roughly 5,800 additional full-time Florida resident students (13 percent of current full-time undergraduate enrollment) without decreasing out-of-state enrollment. Sixteen of the 23 ICUF presidents responded to the survey.

Accountability Measures for ICUF Institutions

The Commission and ICUF agree that the accountability process for ICUF should require data on a few meaningful measures that are tied to state priorities. In its 1993 ***Accountability*** report, the Commission identified three statewide priorities: access/diversity, quality of undergraduate education, and productivity. These priorities reflect points found in the State Comprehensive Plan and the Commission's

Master Plan. The priority areas also provided the framework for the development of accountability measures for the independent sector. Statute specifies that the accountability process "shall make use of existing information submitted to the federal and state governments (Section 240.147(15), F.S.)." Through the collaborative process, the Commission identified the measures in Table 1. Each accountability measure is tied to one of the priority areas and meets the statutory requirement to use existing data submissions. Institutional data required for SACS accreditation is interpreted as meeting the statutory requirement since such accreditation exempts ICUF institutions from licensure by the State Board of Independent Colleges and Universities (Section 246.011(1), F.S.). The proposed framework also aligns with a report released in May 1994 by the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities' Task Force on Appropriate Accountability, which asserts that higher education must find ways to meet legislative needs for public information while protecting institutional diversity/autonomy and reducing duplicative reporting requirements.

Statute now requires the Commission to "periodically review the design and implementation of accountability processes and reports ... of the independent postsecondary system" and to "at least every five years, evaluate the extent to which each [accountability] plan is contributing to the achievement of state goals for postsecondary education." Absent institutional accountability plans for ICUF institutions, the Commission proposes an annual review of aggregate data compiled by ICUF from the 23 institutional reports. While the Commission's review will focus on ICUF as a whole, the sector report will include data disaggregated by institution on each measure. This review will be presented with the accountability review of the public sector.

The Florida Resident Access Grant: Background

The Commission's new accountability responsibility also requires an assessment of the benefits and cost-effectiveness of the Florida Resident Access Grant (FRAG)--formerly called the Tuition Voucher Program. The FRAG was created by the Legislature in 1979 as a non-need-based program to provide tuition assistance to Florida's undergraduates who attend independent, nonprofit, SACS-accredited institutions in the state. The program's enabling legislation, Section 240.605, F.S., identifies the program's goals:

(1) to broaden student choice;

(2) to support institutional diversity through the provision of a dual system of higher education;

(3) to reduce the tax burden on the citizens of the State (Appendix A).

A FRAG award may not exceed 40 percent of the State's cost per academic year for an undergraduate student in a state university. Eligible students must maintain a minimum cumulative grade point average of 2.0 on a 4.0 scale and earn the equivalent of at least 12 student credit hours for each term an award is received. A student may receive the award for a maximum of nine semesters or 14 quarters.

The Resident Access Grant accounts for 34 percent of all appropriations of state tax funds on behalf of students in independent higher education. The FRAG is the largest single appropriation benefitting independent higher education in Florida, expending roughly $18 million to grant 16,820 students an award of

TABLE 1

INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES OF FLORIDA
Proposed Accountability Measures

	Priority Area Addressed	Measure	Already Required By
1	Productivity	Percent of full-time faculty teaching 3-5, 6-8, 9-11, and 12 or more hours at the undergraduate level as part of regular load, by institution, rank, race, and gender.	IPEDS IC Survey; SACS Criterion 4.4.9
2	Productivity	Percent of undergraduate courses and laboratories taught by ranked faculty and graduate assistants/fellowship recipients, by institution, rank, and course level.	IPEDS IC Survey; SACS Criteria 4.4.4 & 4.4.9
3	Productivity	Number of semesters and academic credits to complete a baccalaureate degree (a) as required in catalog and (b) actually taken by cohort of full-time native students, by institution and discipline.	SACS Criterion 4.1.2; FL SPRE Standards 1 &11
4*	Productivity	Average debt accumulated by cohort of native students in Stafford, Perkins, and institutionally-funded loans at the time of graduation, by institution.	SACS Criterion 5.5.3.6; FL SPRE Standard 5
5	Productivity	Average total state cost per Florida resident undergraduate student (a) per academic year and (b) per undergraduate degree, including programs supported by an academic contract with the State, by institution.	No institutional reporting necessary; data available from OSFA and PEPC.
6	Productivity; Access/Diversity	Four-, five-, and six-year graduation rates, by institution, race, and gender.	FL SPRE Standard 17; Student Right-to-Know
7*	Access/Diversity	Percent of A.A. degree transfer students from Florida public institutions gaining immediate access to chosen field of study, by institution.	SACS 4.1.1, FL SPRE
8*	Access/Diversity	Percent of A.A. degree transfer students from Florida public institutions graduating within 2 to 3 years subsequent to institutional admission, by institution.	FL SPRE
9	Quality Undergrad Education	Pass rates on professional licensure examinations, by institution and professional field.	SACS Criterion 3.1; FL SPRE Standards 10 & 17
10	Quality Undergrad Education	Institutional quality/effectiveness as assessed by surveys of alumni, parents, students, and employers; and as reported by pertinent national rankings.	SACS Criterion 3.1
11	Quality Undergrad Education	Average class size, by institution and discipline.	SACS Criterion 4.4.9
12	Quality Undergrad Education	Of academic programs that sought specialized accreditation or re-accreditation during academic year, number and percent that were granted or denied, by program and institution.	IPEDS IC Survey

* *NOTE: An agency already requires data relating to this measure, but a two year phase-in process would allow institutions to begin collecting the data in the manner in which the accountability report asks for it.*

$1,090 each in 1993-94. Beginning in 1979, the program was phased in over a four-year period. Since 1983, the FRAG appropriation has increased 97 percent and the number of students served annually has increased 15 percent. The maximum individual award allowable has increased 52 percent over the same time period (Appendix E). However, the actual individual award granted has remained level since 1987-88. At the same time, tuition and fees charged by ICUF institutions have increased steadily. Between 1979-80 and 1994-95, average ICUF tuition and fees have increased by 275 percent. This compares with an increase of 137 percent in state universities and 156 percent in public community colleges.

Five states other than Florida provide tuition equalization grants such as the FRAG to reduce tuition differences between private and public colleges (Appendix E). While the amount of the FRAG is competitive with that of other tuition equalization grants, the average payout per student in those states has increased by over 50 percent in the last decade. Florida's average payout per student has increased 15 percent over the same time span.

Assessment of the FRAG

The Commission's assessment focuses primarily on the program's benefits and cost-effectiveness to the State. The following analyses will support this assessment:

Cost-Effectiveness

1. How does the State's annual cost to educate FRAG recipients with financial need compare with the State's cost to enroll an equal number of FTE in the public sector?

Thirty-five percent of the students receiving the FRAG in 1993-94 also received the need-based Florida Student Assistance Grant (Appendix E). Were the FRAG not available, it is reasonable to assume that these 5,887 students who qualified for state need-based aid would be among the most likely of all FRAG recipients to migrate to the less-costly public sector.

Awarding a Florida Resident Access Grant to 5,887 students costs the State approximately $6.4 million. How much would it cost the State if these students were enrolled in a state university instead? For 1994-95, the university system average funding appropriated, excluding tuition, for an undergraduate student taking 40 credit hours was approximately $5,800. This includes funding for instruction, research, and public service. At $5,800 per student, 5,887 additional students would cost the State $34.1 million, over 430 percent of the cost for these students under the Resident Access Grant program.

Statute sets the upper limit for the Resident Access Grant at 40 percent of the full cost to the State per academic year of an undergraduate student in a state university. The grant is currently valued at 19 percent of the State's annual cost to educate an undergraduate in the State University System.

2. Utilizing time-to-degree data provided in the ICUF accountability report, how does the State's cost to produce graduates who received FRAG compare to its cost to graduate an equal number of FTE in the public sector?

The ICUF accountability report due in March 1995 will include information regarding the average number of semesters taken by a cohort of native students to complete a baccalaureate degree. The Commission will extend its cost-effectiveness analysis to include the State's cost to produce an equivalent number of graduates in the private and public sectors.

Benefit

Costs are but one of the considerations listed in the Resident Access Grant's enabling legislation. The program is also designed to benefit the State by broadening student choice and supporting institutional diversity. The following analyses are being or have been conducted to assess the program's benefit to the State.

1. What have been the trends in ICUF institutions in terms of total and Florida resident full-time undergraduate enrollment since the FRAG's inception?

A survey of ICUF registrars yielded enrollment figures since 1979 for about half the institutions. Sixteen institutions provided historical enrollment data for the decade 1983 to 1993. For those 16 institutions, full-time undergraduate enrollment increased by two percent (from 27,482 to 28,001). Ten of those 16 institutions experienced increases in total headcount of full-time undergraduate students, while six saw decreases. Headcount of Florida resident undergraduates increased by six percent (from 14,917 to 15,820) and by two percent as a proportion of total full-time undergraduate enrollment.

2. What are FRAG recipients' perceptions of the grant's impact on their decision whether to attend college and where?

During Fall 1994, the Commission surveyed a sample of ICUF students to gather information about FRAG recipients' perceptions of the grant's impact on their decisions about college enrollment. See Appendix F for survey and results. Analysis of self-reported survey data revealed the following about students who received the grant in the Fall 1994 semester.

About the Students:

- 25 percent identified themselves as independent for financial aid purposes.

- Gift aid (e.g., grants, scholarships, and tuition discounts) paid for slightly less than half (47 percent) of the respondents' college-related expenses. On average, respondents paid 31 percent of their college-related expenses themselves from sources such as employment, student loans, and personal savings. Students relied on parents, other relatives, or friends to pay for 20 percent of their college-related expenses.

About the FRAG:

- Over three-fourths of the students surveyed were attending their first-choice institution, and for over half those students the FRAG was a major factor or the most important factor in their college decision.

- Fifty-six percent of those currently receiving the FRAG were aware of the program prior to making their college choice; 54 percent said the grant was a major factor or the most important factor in their decision to attend a private institution in Florida. Seventeen percent of those surveyed said the grant played no part in their college decision.

- Twenty-three percent of the respondents indicated that they would have enrolled in a non-ICUF institution were the FRAG not available; one-third would have incurred more debt to remain at their current ICUF institution. One-fourth indicated that they or their families would have been able to absorb the additional cost without borrowing or working more.

Based on student responses, it appears that the FRAG is making a contribution to the preservation of the dual system of higher education in Florida. For most of the respondents, attending an independent institution in Florida was their first choice. For over half those students attending their first choice institution, the FRAG was a major or the most important factor enabling them to do so. Fifty-six percent would have gone elsewhere or incurred more debt.

3. What proportion of tuition/fees has been covered by the grant over time?

Historical information demonstrates that the grant's benefit to the individual recipient is decreasing steadily. Each individual award amounted to 29 percent of average tuition and fees in 1979. By 1994-95, the award amounted to 11 percent of average tuition and fees (Appendix E).

IV. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

This progress report proposes a process and several characteristics of a state-level evaluation of system and institutional accountability plans and reports for Florida's public and independent postsecondary education sectors. Major findings and conclusions concerning the proposed process are summarized in general issue topics below.

Annual Review of Accountability

Findings

- Support for independent higher education is contained in the State Comprehensive Plan, statutes, and the Commission's ***Master Plan***. In its 1982 ***Master Plan*** and subsequent documents, the Commission has supported a strong dual system of higher education to promote student choice and institutional diversity. A periodic evaluation which includes benefit and cost effectiveness analyses of the Resident Access Grant program would assess how well the State is meeting legislative intent.

- The Commission and ICUF concur that the accountability process should require data on a few meaningful measures that are tied to state priorities. They jointly developed a draft list of measures and an accountability process. Institutional reports and the first ICUF aggregate report will available by early 1995.

- A single document is needed from ICUF which reports sector-wide as well as individual institutional performance on accountability measures.

- In the public sector, the latest SUS report presented a revised plan linking accountability measures to the Regents' Master Plan. Also, a Resource and Productivity Accountability Model was developed to display information on resources, expenditures and productivity.

- The latest CCS report also linked accountability requirements with the major mission/responsibility areas of the community colleges and the Community College System Master Plan. Goals were established for each mission area and indicators and benchmarks were identified for each goal. The 1993 report also shows how these goals relate to Master Plan strategic goals.

- Statutes require that the State University System and the Community College System submit accountability reports annually by December 31st. Both systems depend on multiple data files to produce information for the performance measures, but all necessary data files are not available from the institutions in the time needed to allow for thoughtful analysis or a check for data accuracy by the system office before meeting the current submission date of December 31st for the system report.

Conclusions:

(1) The Commission will prepare a report annually which reviews the design and implementation of the accountability processes and reports of the public systems as well as of public and private institutions. The purpose of the Commission's annual report will be twofold: (a) examine the relationship between accountability and achieving continual improvement in institutional effectiveness, and (b) assess progress toward achieving state priorities.

(2) Submission of an annual review of a representative sample of public institutional reports and plans--rather than a review of all institutional reports--will allow the Commission to meet statutory reporting

requirements in a short time frame. All institutions in the public systems will be reviewed within a four-year period. Thus, the Commission will annually review accountability plans and reports from three universities and seven community colleges. Each year's group of approximately ten institutions will be selected jointly with staff from the State University System and the Community College system to represent diversity within each system. To the extent possible, the selection will be based on institutional mission, geographic location, and size.

(3) The performance indicators for independent institutions proposed in this report are appropriate initial accountability measures to assess the contribution of accredited independent institutions in the achievement of the statewide priorities for quality undergraduate education, access/diversity, and productivity. A review of ICUF reports over the first few years may indicate that current measures need to be amended.

(4) Since the Commission will be requesting system reports from the public sector, a parallel procedure will be for Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida to compile an accountability report with aggregate and individual institutional data on each measure for its member institutions. ICUF members will reach agreement on a standardized method of reporting data related to each measure. The Commission's role will be one of review and analysis of sector-wide information. The Commission's annual review will summarize the contribution of ICUF institutions to the achievement of statewide priorities and will display institution-specific data through appendices. Additionally, the annual review will include cost effectiveness analyses such as (1) comparisons of cost to the State to educate in the public sector those Florida Resident Access Grant recipients with financial need and (2) comparisons of cost to produce graduates in the public and independent sectors.

(5) Changing annual reporting dates for system-level accountability reports from December 31st to March 1st will enhance the quality of the data and the analyses submitted to the Legislature. It is understood that extending the annual system reporting dates from December to March will enable the systems to use prior year's data for their annual accountability report. Additionally, submission of the annual ICUF accountability report by March 1st will facilitate the Commission's analysis of comparable year information and completion of its annual accountability report.

(6) A reporting date of November 1st for the Commission's annual evaluation of institutional accountability reports will allow opportunity to review individual institutional reports and the system reports after they are finalized rather than during the process of development. The Commission will submit the first annual accountability evaluation by November 1, 1995 and annually thereafter.

Summative Evaluation

Findings:

- The Commission's 1993 report, *Accountability in Florida's Postsecondary Education System*, recommended that statewide accountability focus on three priority areas: **access/ diversity, productivity, and quality of undergraduate education**. These areas are prominent concerns in recent master plans from the Board of Regents, the State Board of Community Colleges, and the Commission.

- The report further recommended that a periodic accountability review assess system

and institutional efforts in terms of progress toward achieving these priorities.

- Additionally, state-level monitoring of postsecondary accountability provides an opportunity to promote stronger linkages between accountability in higher education and key state-level processes such as strategic planning and performance-based budgeting.

- A state-wide evaluation to assess progress toward state-wide goals would be incomplete without providing for the contributions of the independent sector.

- Members of the postsecondary community are concerned that much effort and diverse resources will be committed to generate accountability information, but the necessary funding and policy support from state agencies may not materialize.

Conclusions:

(7) To meet statutory requirements to "at least every 5 years, evaluate the extent to which each plan is contributing to the achievement of state goals for postsecondary education," the Commission will submit a fifth-year or summative report recapitulating and synthesizing the results of the prior four years reviews into a single report which evaluates progress toward state goals. The Commission will submit the first summative analysis of progress toward State goals by November 1, 1999.

(8) The summative evaluation of accountability will also include an analysis of the benefits and cost-effectiveness of FRAG, utilizing data such as enrollment trends, student perceptions survey results, and comparisons of state costs to enroll and graduate students in the public and independent sectors.

(9) In conjunction with the periodic analysis of progress toward state goals, the Commission will strive for a comprehensive evaluation, including analysis of support from those state-level bodies with the funding and policy-making authority to influence accountability.

Incentive Funding

Findings:

- ***Challenges, Realities, Strategies*** suggests that a redesigned and restructured system for allocation and use of state resources is needed. A specific strategy put forth in the ***Master Plan*** called for incentive funding linked to objectives in each sector or across sectors.

- The ***Accountability*** report (1993) recommended that incentive funding be provided to assist postsecondary institutions in attaining specified objectives for each of the state-level priority areas.

- Incentive funding is a reward based on past performance; initiative funding is similar but the award is given to an institution or program so that something can be started. The incentive funding approach would appear to better reflect the intent of accountability.

- Like the Teaching Incentive Program in the State University System and the performance- based funding incentives to vocational programs in the Community College System, procedures and criteria would be needed and desired outcomes defined in order to allocate the incentive dollars.

Conclusion:

(10) Provision for each public community college and university to compete for accountability incentive grants will support State and institutional commitment to the

priority areas. Incentive initiatives will be tied to performance and attainment of specified objectives for the priority areas of access/diversity, productivity, and quality. Specific objectives might include increases in minority graduation rates, graduates in high cost programs serving targeted economic development occupational clusters, and other objectives tied to attainment of accountability goals.

Appendix A

STATUTORY REFERENCES FOR ACCOUNTABILITY

- Postsecondary Education Planning Commission
- State University System
- State Board of Community Colleges
- Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida
- Florida Resident Access Grant

Revised Statute, Section 240.147, Florida Statutes

Section 21. Subsection (4) of section 240.147, Florida Statutes, is amended, and subsections (15) and (16) are added to said section, to read:

240.147 Powers and duties of the commission.--The commission shall:

(4) Recommend to the State Board of Education contracts with independent institutions to conduct programs consistent with the state master plan for postsecondary education. In making recommendations, the commission shall consider the annual report submitted by the Board of Regents pursuant to s. 240.209(3)(r). Each program shall be reviewed, with the cooperation of the institution, every 5 years.

(15) In consultation with the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida, recommend to the Legislature accountability measures and an accountability process for independent institutions that participate in the Florida resident access grant program. The process shall make use of existing information submitted to the federal and state governments. The process shall provide for an assessment of the benefits and cost-effectiveness of the Florida resident access grant program in providing state residents with access to 4-year college programs and with the successful completion of a baccalaureate degree. The commission shall provide oversight of this accountability process.

(16) Periodically review the design and implementation of the accountability processes and reports of the State University System, State Community College System, and public and independent postsecondary institutions. At least every 5 years, evaluate the extent to which each plan is contributing to the achievement of state goals for postsecondary education and report to the State Board of Education, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with recommendations on any changes needed in the accountability process or plans.

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

Revised Accountability Legislation, Section 240.214, Florida Statutes

Section 23. Section 240.214, Florida Statutes, is amended to read:

240.214 State University System accountability process.--It is the intent of the Legislature that an accountability process be implemented which provides for the systematic, ongoing evaluation of quality and effectiveness in the State University System. It is further the intent of the Legislature that this accountability process monitor performance at the system level in each of the major areas of instruction, research, and public service, while recognizing the differing missions of each of the state universities. The accountability process shall provide for the adoption of systemwide performance standards and performance goals for each standard identified through a collaborative effort involving the State University System, the Legislature, and the Governor's Office. The accountability process shall result in an annual accountability report to the Legislature. ~~be-implemented-in-incremental-phases,-as-follows:~~

(1) The annual accountability report shall include goals and measurable objectives related to the systemwide master plan pursuant to s. 240.209. ~~No-later-than-December 31,-1999,-and-annually-thereafter,-the-board-shall-submit-to the-legislature-an-evaluation-of-the-production-of-classroom contact-hours-at-each-university-pursuant-to-s.-240.243.--The evaluation-must-include-a-specific-analysis-of-the-contact-hour-expectations-resulting-from-the-multiplication-of-the requirements-of-s.-240.243-by-the-instructional-man-years generated-through-the-legislative-enrollment-formula.--The analysis-must,-in-addition,-include-the-contact-hour expectations-resulting-from-the-multiplication-of-84-percent of-the-positions-provided-for-undergraduate-enhancement-by-the contact-hour-requirements-of-s.-240.243.--The-board-may-also~~

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

conduct-this-analysis-using-alternative-formulas.--The-board shall-recommend-to-the-legislature-any-appropriate modifications-to-this-section,-s.-240.243,-or-other-current policies.--These-recommendations-shall-be-included-in-the annual-accountability-report-submitted-pursuant-to-subsection (3).--The-reports-developed-pursuant-to-this-section-shall-be designed-in-consultation-with-the-legislature.

(8)--By-October-1,-1994,-the-Board-of-Regents-shall submit-to-the-Governor,-the-President-of-the-Senate,-and-the Speaker-of-the-House-of-Representatives,-a-plan-for-the implementation-of-the-balance-of-the-State-University-System accountability-process.--The-plan-shall-be-designed-in consultation-with-the-legislature,-the-Governor's-Office,-and the-Office-of-the-Auditor-General.--The-plan-must-provide-a timetable-that-identifies-the-specific-performance-standards and-related-goals-to-be-implemented-each-year-and-must-provide for-full-implementation-of-the-accountability-process-by December-31,-1993.--The-plan-must-also-identify-the-data-files that-will-be-used-to-substantiate-achievement-of-performance goals.--If-it-is-necessary-to-develop-new-data-files-or-modify existing-files,-the-plan-must-describe-the-content-of-such files-and-include-a-sample-file-format. The plan must include, at a minimum, objectives related to data on the following measures performance-standards:

(a) Total student credit hours produced,-by institution-and-by-discipline;

(b).--Total-number-of-degrees-awarded,-by-institution and-by-discipline;

(b)(c) Total number of contact hours of instruction produced by faculty, by institution, rank, and course level;

(c)(d) Pass rates on professional licensure examinations, by institution;

(d)(e) Institutional quality as assessed by followup, such as analyses of employment information on former students,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

national rankings, and surveys of alumni, parents, clients, and employers;

(e)(f) Length of time and number of academic credits required to complete an academic degree, by institution and by degree;

(f)(g) Enrollment, progression, retention, and graduation rates by race and, gender, ~~and disability~~;

(g)(h) Student course demand analysis; and

~~(i) Classroom utilization~~.

(h) An analysis of administrative and support functions;

(i) Every 3 years, beginning 1995-1996, an analysis of the cumulative debt of students; and

(j) An evaluation of the production of classroom contact hours at each university in comparison to a standard of 12 contact hours per term or 32 contact hours per year for each full-time instructional position and the level of funding provided for instruction.

(2)(3) By December 31 of each year, ~~Beginning December 1, 1992,~~ the Board of Regents shall submit the an annual accountability report providing information on the implementation of performance standards, actions taken to improve university achievement of performance goals, the and achievement of performance goals during the prior year, and initiatives to be undertaken during the next year. The accountability reports shall be designed in consultation with the Governor's Office, the Office of the Auditor General, and the Legislature.

(3) The Board of Regents shall recommend in the annual accountability report any appropriate modifications to this section.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Section 24. Section 240.2145, Florida Statutes, is amended to read:

240.2145 State University System accountability process; annual evaluation.--Beginning January 1, 1993, the Board of Regents shall conduct an annual evaluation of the performance of the Chancellor and the state university presidents in achieving the performance goals established in the State University System accountability process plan provided in s. 240.214.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FLORIDA STATE BOARD OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Accountability Legislation, Section 240.324, Florida Statutes

240.324 Community college accountability process.—

(1) It is the intent of the Legislature that a management and accountability process be implemented which provides for the systematic, ongoing improvement and assessment of the improvement of the quality and efficiency of the State Community College System. Accordingly, the State Board of Community Colleges and the community college boards of trustees shall develop and implement a plan to improve and evaluate the instructional and administrative efficiency and effectiveness of the State Community College System. This plan must address the following issues:

(a) Graduation rates of AA and AS degree-seeking students compared to first-time enrolled students seeking the associate degree.

(b) Minority student enrollment and retention rates.

(c) Student performance, including student performance rates on college level academic skills tests, mean grade-point averages for community college AA transfer students, and community college student performance on state licensure examinations.

(d) Job placement rates of community college vocational students.

(e) Student progression by admission status and program.

(f) Other measures as identified by the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission and approved by the State Board of Community Colleges.

(2) By January 1, 1992, the State Board of Community Colleges shall submit to the Governor, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives a plan for addressing these issues. The plan must provide a specific timetable that identifies specific issues to be addressed each year and must provide for full implementation by December 31, 1994. Beginning December 31, 1992, the State Board of Community Colleges shall submit an annual interim report providing the results of initiatives taken during the prior year and the initiatives and related objective performance measures proposed for the next year. The initial plan and each interim plan shall be designed in consultation with staff of the Governor and the Legislature.

(3) Beginning January 1, 1993, the State Board of Community Colleges shall address within the annual evaluation of the performance of the executive director, and the boards of trustees shall address within the annual evaluation of the presidents, the achievement of the performance goals established in the community college accountability plan.

[illegible] — 12 of 91-86

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES OF FLORIDA

Section 246.011, Florida Statutes

246.011 Purpose.—

(1) The Legislature encourages privately supported higher education and intends to aid in protecting the integrity of degrees conferred by privately supported colleges. Sections 246.011–246.151 are intended to aid in protecting the health, education, and welfare of persons who receive educational services and degrees from nonpublic colleges in this state; to aid in protecting employers and others who depend upon people whose educational credentials are from nonpublic colleges in this state; and to aid in protecting nonpublic colleges that currently operate or intend to begin operating in this state. The Legislature finds that both individuals and colleges benefit from a state system that assures that all nonpublic colleges satisfactorily meet minimum educational standards. The Legislature further recognizes the role of regional accrediting associations in setting standards for colleges and universities and encourages the use of the standards of regional accrediting associations as general guidelines for the licensing of nonpublic colleges.

(2) The Legislature recognizes that a degree serves several purposes. Employers rely upon a person's degree in judging that individual's qualifications for employment. Educators rely upon a person's degree to assess the adequacy of that individual's preparation for the pursuit of further education. Therefore, the Legislature intends that the provisions of ss. 246.011–246.151 aid in protecting the integrity of degrees offered by nonpublic colleges by providing for the evaluation of minimum educational requirements.

(3) It is the intent of the Legislature that a nonpublic college which offers both degrees and vocational certificates or diplomas shall be subject to the rules of the State Board of Independent Colleges and Universities as provided by ss. 246.011–246.151 and the State Board of Independent Postsecondary Vocational, Technical, Trade, and Business Schools as provided by ss. 246.201–246.231.

(4) It is the intent of the Legislature to prohibit the granting of false or misleading educational credentials and to prohibit misleading literature, advertising, solicitation, or representations by nonpublic colleges or their agents.

History.—s. 1, ch. 71-128; s. 3, ch. 76-168; s. 1, ch. 77-457; ss. 6, 10, 16, ch. 79-385; s. 7, ch. 80-378; ss. 2, 3, ch. 81-318; ss. 2, 23, 24, ch. 82-203; s. 1, ch. 89-344; ss. 1, 19, 20, ch. 92-321.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FLORIDA RESIDENT ACCESS GRANT

Statutes 240.605, Florida Statutes

Section 32. Section 240.605, Florida Statutes, is amended to read:

240.605 Florida resident access grants State-tuition vouchers.--

(1) The Legislature finds and declares that independent nonprofit colleges and universities eligible to participate in the Florida resident access grant state-tuition voucher program are an integral part of the higher education system in this state and that a significant number of state residents choose this form of higher education. The Legislature further finds that a strong and viable system of independent nonprofit colleges and universities reduces the tax burden on the citizens of the state. Because the Florida Resident Access Grant State-Tuition-Voucher Fund is not related to a student's financial need or other criteria upon which financial aid programs are based, it is the intent of the Legislature that the Florida Resident Access Grant State Tuition-Voucher Fund not be considered a financial aid program but rather a tuition assistance program for its citizens.

(2) There is created the Florida Resident Acce s Grant State-Tuition-Voucher Fund to be administered by the Department of Education. The State Board of Education shall adopt rules for the administration of such fund.

(3) The department shall issue from the fund a Florida resident access grant tuition-voucher to any full-time degree-seeking undergraduate student registered at an independent nonprofit college or university which is located in and chartered by the state; which is accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools; which grants baccalaureate degrees; which is not a state university or state community college; and which has a secular purpose, so long as the receipt of state aid by

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

students at the institution would not have the primary effect of advancing or impeding religion or result in an excessive entanglement between the state and any religious sect. Any independent college or university that was eligible to receive tuition vouchers on January 1, 1989, and which continues to meet the criteria under which its eligibility was established, shall remain eligible to receive Florida resident access grant tuition-voucher payments.

(4) A person is eligible to receive such Florida resident access grant tuition-voucher if:

(a) He meets the general requirements, including residency, for student eligibility as provided in s. 240.404, except as otherwise provided in this section; and

(b)1. He is enrolled as a full-time undergraduate student at an eligible college or university;

2. He is not enrolled in a program of study leading to a degree in theology or divinity; and

3. He is making satisfactory academic progress as defined by the college or university in which he is enrolled.

(5)(a) Funding for the Florida resident access grant shall be based on a formula composed of planned enrollment and the state cost of funding undergraduate enrollment at public institutions pursuant to s. 240.271. ~~The annual percentage adjustment in the State Tuition Voucher Fund must equal the percentage adjustment of state funding in the Instruction and Research/Educational and General Appropriation Category in the State University System, but the adjustment may not exceed +9 percent in a given year.~~ However, the amount of the Florida resident access grant tuition-voucher issued to a full-time student shall be ~~no less than $1,750~~ and no more than 40 percent of the full cost to the state per academic year of an undergraduate student in public postsecondary education established pursuant to s. 240.209 or as specified in the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

General Appropriations Act. The Florida resident access grant tuition-voucher may be paid on a prorated basis in advance of the registration period. The department shall make such payments to the college or university in which the student is enrolled for credit to the student's account for payment of tuition and fees. Institutions shall certify to the department the amount of funds disbursed to each student and shall remit to the department any undisbursed advances or refunds within 60 days of the end of regular registration. Students shall not be eligible to receive the award for more than 9 semesters or 14 quarters, except as otherwise provided in s. 240.404(3).

(b) If the combined amount of the Florida resident access grant tuition-voucher issued pursuant to this act and all other scholarships and grants for tuition or fees exceeds the amount charged to the student for tuition and fees, the department shall reduce the Florida resident access grant tuition-voucher issued pursuant to this act by an amount equal to such excess.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix B

QUESTIONS FOR STATE-LEVEL ACCOUNTABILITY EVALUATIONS

QUESTIONS FOR USE IN STATE-LEVEL EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL AND SYSTEM ACCOUNTABILITY REPORTS

Accountability for Institutional Improvement

1) Do accountability plans and reports support and foster institutional effectiveness as the primary purpose of accountability?

2) Do they verify that institutions are fulfilling the postsecondary mission specified in statute while making efficient and effective use of their resources?

3) How do institutions build upon the results of accountability activities to increase their effectiveness?

Accountability for Statewide Goal Achievement

1) Do the plans and reports show progress toward achieving the statewide priorities of quality of undergraduate education, access/diversity, and productivity for postsecondary education?

2) In the aggregate, what progress has been made toward state priorities?

3) How has the independent sector contributed through the resident access grant toward the achievement of the state priority of access/diversity?

State-level Accountability of Related Factors/Influences

1) Have state-level entities with funding and policy-making authority to influence accountability provided adequate and appropriate policy guidance and fiscal support for accountability expectations?

2) Has incentive funding been provided to assist systems and institutions in attaining objectives for each state-level priority area?

Accountability and Budget Processes

1) Do annual budget requests from the systems and the institutions specify how statewide priorities and system goals are reflected in the requests?

2) Have funding formulas for postsecondary education responded to and reinforced the state-level goals identified in the State's master plans, strategic plans, and accountability documents?

3) Have institutions targeted a portion of their existing funds for achievement of identified goals/objectives subject to external validation?

Appendix C

INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES OF FLORIDA: MEMBER INSTITUTIONS

INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES OF FLORIDA

Member Institutions

	Institution	Location
1.	Barry University	Miami Shores, FL
2.	Bethune-Cookman College	Daytona Beach, FL
3.	Clearwater Christian College	Clearwater, FL
4.	Eckerd College	St. Petersburg, FL
5.	Edward Waters College	Jacksonville, FL
6.	Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University	Daytona Beach, FL
7.	Flagler College	St. Augustine, FL
8.	Florida Institute of Technology	Melbourne, FL
9.	Florida Memorial College	Miami, FL
10.	Florida Southern College	Lakeland, FL
11.	Jacksonville University	Jacksonville, FL
12.	Lynn University	Boca Raton, FL
13.	Nova Southeastern University	Ft. Lauderdale, FL
14.	Palm Beach Atlantic College	West Palm Beach, FL
15.	Ringling School of Art and Design	Sarasota, FL
16.	Rollins College	Winter Park, FL
17.	Saint Leo College	Saint Leo, FL
18.	Saint Thomas University	Miami, FL
19.	Stetson University	DeLand, FL
20.	University of Miami	Coral Gables, FL
21.	University of Tampa	Tampa, FL
22.	Warner Southern College	Lake Wales, FL
23.	Webber College	Babson Park, FL

SOURCE: Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida, August 1994.

Appendix D

INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES OF FLORIDA ACCOUNTABILITY RESOURCE GROUP

ICUF ACCOUNTABILITY RESOURCE GROUP

T.K. Wetherell, President
Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida

William Proctor, President
Flagler College

Steven Ullmann
Vice Provost , Faculty Affairs and University Administration
University of Miami

James Beasley
Vice President, Campus Life
Stetson University

Catherine Morgan
Director, Institutional Research
Jacksonville University

Leonard Gude
Director, Financial Aid
Florida Institute of Technology

Bill Abare
Chair, Student Financial Aid Commission
Flagler College

David Wright
Research Assistant
Postsecondary Education Planning Commission

Invited Guests

William Proctor
Executive Director
Postsecondary Education Planning Commission

Cheryl Blanco
Education Policy Director
Postsecondary Education Planning Commission

Larry Arnold and Sue Jones
Office of Student Financial Assistance

Appendix E

TABLES RELATED TO INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES OF FLORIDA

TABLE 1

HEADCOUNT OF FLORIDA RESIDENTS ENROLLED AS FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATES, INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES OF FLORIDA, FALL 1993

INSTITUTIONS	FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENT	FLORIDA RESIDENTS	
		N	%
ICUF TOTAL	**44,253**	**23,433**	**53%**
Barry University	1,811	1,249	69%
Bethune-Cookman College	2,128	1,744	82%
Clearwater Christian College	408	248	61%
Eckerd College	1,541	595	39%
Edward Waters College	837	620	74%
Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University	4,178	814	19%
Flagler College	1,345	766	57%
Florida Institute of Technology	1,854	335	18%
Florida Memorial College	1,463	1,104	75%
Florida Southern College	1,506	692	46%
Jacksonville University	1,564	804	51%
Lynn University	989	495	50%
Nova Southeastern University	3,262	2,707	83%
Palm Beach Atlantic College	1,311	866	66%
Ringling School of Art and Design	748	405	54%
Rollins College	1,668	663	40%
Saint Leo College	3,400	704	21%
Saint Thomas University	1,606	1,335	83%
Stetson University	1,964	1,554	79%
University of Miami	8,352	4,363	52%
University of Tampa	1,492	749	50%
Warner Southern College	469	404	86%
Webber College	357	217	61%

Note: Lynn University and Nova Southeastern University estimated based on available SBICU data.

Source: PEPC Survey of ICUF Registrars, Fall 1994.

TABLE 2

FLORIDA RESIDENT ACCESS GRANT
FUNDING HISTORY

	AMOUNT APPROPRIATED	AMOUNT EXPENDED	NUMBER STUDENTS SERVED	PROVISO MAXIMUM AWARD	ACTUAL AWARD AMOUNT
1979-80	$ 2,400,000	$ 2,400,000	3,518	$ 750	$ 750
1980-81	$ 4,100,000	$ 4,100,000	6,827	$ 750	$ 750
1981-82	$ 7,299,000	$ 7,350,000	9,914	$ 750	$ 750
1982-83	$ 9,500,000	$ 9,310,000	13,422	$ 750	$ 717
1983-84	$ 10,100,000	$ 10,100,000	14,645	$ 750	$ 716
1984-85	$ 11,900,000	$ 11,900,000	15,613	$ 835	$ 778
1985-86	$ 13,323,084	$ 13,144,215	15,886	$ 876	$ 852
1986-87	$ 15,989,392	$ 14,078,496	13,976	$ 1,000	$ 1,000
1987-88	$ 15,975,700	$ 14,920,950	14,083	$ 1,100	$ 1,100
1988-89	$ 16,672,650	$ 16,369,841	15,174	$ 1,150	$ 1,122
1989-90	$ 16,672,650	$ 16,313,685	15,035	$ 1,150	$ 1,110
1990-91	$ 18,839,300	$ 17,175,945	16,127	$ 1,200	$ 1,100
1991-92	$ 18,215,531	$ 16,588,799	16,987	$ 1,200	$ 990
1992-93	$ 16,564,373	$ 15,809,054	17,424	$ 1,200	$ 924
1993-94	$ 18,539,373	$ 17,849,215	16,820	$ 1,200	$ 1,090
1994-95	$ 19,872,443	N/A	N/A	$ 1,300	$ 1,090

Notes: (1) Student count is not an unduplicated headcount.
(2) 1990-91 appropriation was reduced to $17,136,374.
(3) 1991-92 appropriation was reduced to $17,201,717.

Source: Department of Education, Office of Student Financial Assistance, 1994.

TABLE 3

COMPARISON OF TUITION OFFSET GRANT PROGRAMS IN SIX STATES, 1993-94

STATE	PROGRAM	NUMBER STUDENTS 1993-94	TOTAL PAYOUT 1993-94
Alabama	Student Grant	7,245	$ 5,456,000
Florida	Resident Access Grant	17,119	$ 18,539,000
Georgia	Tuition Equalization Grant	17,511	$ 17,512,000
North Carolina	Legislative Tuition Grant	21,550	$ 24,783,000
Ohio	Student Choice Grant	41,642	$ 22,806,000
Virginia	Tuition Assistance Grant	11,776	$ 17,842,000

STATE	AVERAGE PAYOUT PER STUDENT			
		1 YEAR	5 YEAR	9 YEAR
	1993-94	% CHANGE	% CHANGE	% CHANGE
Alabama	$753	31%	80%	86%
Florida	$1,083	19%	-10%	15%
Georgia	$1,000	0%	11%	51%
North Carolina	$1,150	21%	20%	54%
Ohio	$548	7%	17%	10%
Virginia	$1,515	7%	16%	55%

Source: Office of Student Financial Assistance; and Annual Survey Reports, National Association of State Scholarships and Grant Programs.

TABLE 4

FRAG RECIPIENTS IN ICUF INSTITUTIONS ALSO RECEIVING FSAG, 1993-94

Institution	FRAG Recipients	FSAG Recipients	Number FRAG Recipients also Receiving FSAG	Percent FRAG Recipients also Receiving FSAG
TOTAL	**18,969**	**7,200**	**6,705**	**35%**
Barry	1,077	346	336	31%
Bethune Cookman	1,406	855	724	51%
Clearwater Christian	251	113	112	45%
Eckerd	511	213	212	41%
Edward Waters	387	101	66	17%
Embry-Riddle	547	260	244	45%
Flagler	835	235	231	28%
FIT	382	205	176	46%
Florida Memorial	876	391	335	38%
Florida Southern	1,125	255	243	22%
Jacksonville	725	213	199	27%
Lynn	194	47	40	21%
Nova Southeastern	1,112	434	393	35%
Palm Beach Atlantic	902	253	247	27%
Ringling School	368	150	146	40%
Rollins	508	254	197	39%
Rollins Continuing Ed	207	0	0	0%
Saint Leo	705	218	214	30%
Saint Thomas	770	258	252	33%
Stetson	1,417	535	528	37%
University of Miami	3,342	1,439	1,396	42%
University of Tampa	607	202	199	33%
Warner Southern	478	126	125	26%
Webber	237	97	90	38%

Source: Department of Education, Office of Student Financial Assistance, 1994.

TABLE 5

RESIDENT ACCESS GRANT AS A PERCENTAGE OF AVERAGE TUITION AND FEES IN INDEPENDENT NON-PROFIT BACCALAUREATE INSTITUTIONS, 1979-80 TO 1994-95

	Average T & F	FRAG Award	FRAG as % of T & F
1979-80	**$ 2,548**	**$ 750**	**29%**
1980-81	$ 2,866	$ 750	26%
1981-82	$ 3,195	$ 750	23%
1982-83	$ 3,529	$ 717	20%
1983-84	$ 3,869	$ 716	19%
1984-85	$ 4,254	$ 778	18%
1985-86	$ 4,493	$ 852	19%
1986-87	$ 4,614	$ 1,000	22%
1987-88	$ 5,072	$ 1,100	22%
1988-89	$ 5,520	$ 1,122	20%
1989-90	$ 6,494	$ 1,110	17%
1990-91	$ 6,974	$ 1,100	16%
1991-92	$ 7,647	$ 990	13%
1992-93	$ 8,184	$ 924	11%
1993-94	$ 8,962	$ 1,090	12%
1994-95	**$ 9,566**	**$ 1,090**	**11%**

Source: Department of Education, Office of Student Financial Assistance.

Appendix F

SURVEY OF FLORIDA RESIDENT ACCESS GRANT RECIPIENTS, FALL 1994

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION PLANNING COMMISSION

METHODOLOGY FOR SURVEY OF FALL 1994 FRAG RECIPIENTS

The Commission surveyed a sample of ICUF students to gather information about FRAG recipients' perceptions of the grant's impact on their decisions about college enrollment. The survey instrument was designed by Commission staff and was distributed and collected through ICUF Student Aid Offices. The institutions were requested to return enough surveys to guarantee a return of roughly five percent (841) of the total number of the prior year's FRAG recipients. Surveys were returned for 658 students, 90 percent of whom were actually receiving the FRAG in the Fall 1994 semester. The resulting 594 surveys retained for analysis constitute 76 percent of the total number of surveys sought. It was calculated that 543 completed surveys were needed for an interval estimate that will be within 5 percent of the true population proportion of responses 98 percent of the time. A summary of responses is attached.

INSTITUTIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS RECEIVING FRAG IN FALL 1994

Barry	36	6%
Bethune-Cookman	0	0%
Clearwater Christian	15	3%
Eckerd	24	4%
Edward Waters	9	2%
Embry-Riddle	25	4%
FIT	18	3%
Flagler	40	7%
Florida Memorial	28	5%
Florida Southern	44	7%
Jacksonville	31	5%
Lynn	0	0%
Nova Southeastern	38	6%
Palm Beach Atlantic	25	4%
Ringling School	15	3%
Rollins	21	4%
St. Leo	27	5%
St. Thomas	30	5%
Stetson	67	11%
University of Miami	45	8%
University of Tampa	27	5%
Warner Southern	20	3%
Webber	9	2%
Total	**594**	**100%**

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION PLANNING COMMISSION

Survey of Fall 1994 Florida Resident Access Grant Recipients

n=594

The Florida Legislature has directed the Commission to study the benefits of the Florida Resident Access Grant (formerly the State Tuition Voucher). Please take a moment now to answer a few questions about yourself and the Grant's impact on your decisions about college. Your answers will help the Legislature better understand how the Grant affects students' choice of whether and where to attend college. Please complete the survey only once.

About the Student

1. What is your gender? Male (**40%**) Female (**60%**)

2. What is your classification? Freshman (**24%**) Sophomore (**20%**) Junior (**27%**) Senior (**29%**)

3. Questions 3a - 3f relate to your filing status for financial aid purposes.

a. Were you born before January 1, 1971?	Yes	No
b. Are you a veteran of the U.S. Armed Forces?	Yes	No
c. Were you legally married (or separated) as of January 1, 1994?	Yes	No
d. Do you have legal dependents (other than a spouse)?	Yes	No
e. Are both of your parents deceased?	Yes	No
f. Are you a ward of the court?	Yes	No

(**25% Independent**) (**75% Dependent**)

4. What percent of your college-related expenses is paid by each of the following sources? (*Sample means are reported.*)

a. Yourself (from employment, student loans, savings, etc.)	31 %
b. Other individuals (parents, relatives, friends, etc.)	20 %
c. Gift Aid (grants, scholarships, tuition discounts)	47 %
d. Other sources	2 %

About the Institution

5. What college or university do you attend? (*See page F-2.*)

6. Was this college or university your first choice? Yes (**76%**) No (**24%**)

About the Florida Resident Access Grant

7. Are you receiving the Florida Resident Access Grant this semester? Yes (**100%**) No (**0%**)

8. Were you aware of the Grant prior to making your choice of which college to attend? Yes (**56%**) No (**44%**)

(over) ☞

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

9. How important was your receipt of the Florida Resident Access Grant in your decision to attend a private college or university in Florida?

Not a factor	Minor factor	Major factor	Most important factor
(17%)	**(29%)**	**(45%)**	**(9%)**

10. Please complete the following sentence.

Without the Florida Resident Access Grant, I would have: (circle one letter)

12%	a.	worked to earn more money in order to stay at this school.
33%	b.	borrowed more money in order to stay at this school.
5%	c.	paid more myself in order to stay at this school.
20%	d	relied on my family to pay more in order for me to stay at this school.
6%	e.	gone to a Florida public community college instead.
11%	f.	gone to a public university in Florida instead.
3%	g.	gone to a postsecondary institution outside of Florida instead.
3%	h.	not attended college.
3%	i.	other: _____
4%	*j.*	*respondent selected multiple strategies to remain at current institution.*

Please use the remaining space for any comments you would like to make about the Florida Resident Access Grant Program.

- 128 respondents (22% of the sample) wrote comments. 41 respondents stressed the importance of the grant in enabling them to choose a private institution and the necessity of maintaining the program. Sample comments:

  "Withouth the FRAG, I would not be in school. It allowed me to focus more on my future and less on my finances."

  "[FRAG] helps those of us who do not qualify for aid but need it to finance our schooling. Parents' income may disqualify a child for aid, but certain family expenses exist that are not considered on the financial aid application."

- 26 respondents expressed a desire for the FRAG award amount should be raised. Sample comment:

  "The FRAG is critical to my college career, and the amount should rise each year to compensate for tuition increases."

- 9 respondents indicated that the grant amount does not seriously reduce their tuition, but they do rely on it to help defray other necessary college costs. Sample comments:

  "Although it is a small percentage of my tuition, every little bit helps. Thanks."

  "The FRAG allows the student at least spending money on books, without which an education is unattainable. Plus, other expenses such as transportation have to be considered."

Please return the completed survey according to the instructions given by your institution's Financial Aid Office. Your responses will be confidential, and individual results will not be released. Thank you for your cooperation.